

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1, 3 – 9 and 11 – 16 are pending, claims 1, 3 – 9 and 11 – 16 are rejected under Double Patenting. In this response claims 1, 9, 13 and 15 are amended.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3 – 9 and 11 – 16 on the ground of non-statutory obviousness type double patenting, citing US 7,119,774 (Willis) and US 6,384,873 (Rumreich). Support for amendment of claims 1, 9, 13 and 15 may be found in the specification on page 7 lines 11-12, on page 7 lines 22 – 25 and on page 8 lines 7 -14. Amended claim 1 recites, inter alia,

“a split low pass filter arrangement for independently low pass filtering rising transients and lengthening a fall time of falling transients in said low brightness signal to reduce adjacent pixel interdependence, wherein the split low pass filter arrangement comprises at least two low pass filters at least one of which is comprised of asymmetrically weighted taps thereby anticipating a bright-going signal and starting the bright-going signal going brighter earlier, at least one associated delay circuit, and a maximum selector circuit”

Neither the previous Willis patent nor the Rumreich patent discloses nor suggests to asymmetrically low-pass filter a portion of the low brightness component so as to anticipate a bright-going signal, thereby starting the bright-going signal going brighter earlier. The low pass filters disclosed by Rumreich are disclosed to generate the vertical detail component in a comb filter. Although Rumreich is mute on the characteristics of the low pass filters shown in figure 2, it is well known by those skilled in the art that such filtering is linear phase, thus

requiring symmetric tap weighting. The combination of the previous Willis patent and the Rumreich patent would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to filter a low brightness component using an asymmetrically weighted low pass filter to anticipate a bright-going signal and thus start the bright-going signal going brighter earlier in order to reduce adjacent pixel interdependence in an LCOS display. Applicant respectfully asserts that the present application is patentably distinct from the previous Willis patent and respectfully requests that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

Independent claims 9, 13 and 15 have each been amended in a manner corresponding to the amendment of claim 1 and thus are also not subject to double patenting rejection nor obviousness rejection in view of Willis and Rumreich. Withdrawal of rejections of independent claims 1, 9, 13 and 15 is respectfully requested. Dependent claims 3-8, 11, 12, 14 and 16 being properly drawn to independent claims believed to be allowable are also allowable.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's objections and rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (317) 587-4029, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No additional fee is believed due. However, if an additional fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'William A. Lagoni', written over a horizontal line.

By: William A. Lagoni
Reg. No. 47,730

Ser. No. 10/078,778
Amdt. dated July 21, 2008
Reply to Office action of June 2, 2008

PU020026

Phone (317) 587-4029

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
July 21, 2008